AN ANSWER TO THE BRIEF REMARKS OF *William Berriman*, D.D.

Rector of St. *Andrews*'s *Underſhaft*, and Fellow of *Eton* College:

ON

Mr. CHANDLER's *Introduction to the Hiſtory of the Inquiſition.*

In a LETTER to the ſaid Doctor.

By *SAMUEL CHANDLER.*

Quid verum atque decens curo et rogo, et omnis in hoc ſum;
Condo et compono, quae mox depromere poſſum.
Horat. Epiſt. l. 1.

Impiger, iracundus, inexorabilis, acer. *Hor. de Arte Poet.*

The SECOND EDITION.

LONDON:
Printed for JOHN GRAY, at the *Croſs-Keys* in the *Poultry*, near *Cheapſide*. 1733.

[Price Six-Pence.]

AN

ANSWER, &c.

SIR,

WHAT terrour ſeized me, when I firſt read the advertiſement and title of your Pamphlet! I had almoſt ſaid,

Steteruntque comae et vox faucibus haeſit.

The charge of *groſs miſrepreſentations of fact* made me dread my fate, and fear leaſt my paſſion for the civil and religious liberties of mankind had drawn me into ſome miſtakes, contrary to the truth of hiſtory. But I ſoon

found that your title page was the worſt I had to fear; and notwithſtanding the ſevere reproaches thrown on me my panick ſoon left me, and to my pleaſure I ſaw I had to do with an impotent, though angry adverſary.

You are I think exceeding unhappy in the beginning and end of your performance. You ſet out with a charge, which I am ſure is not true, and conclude with ſomething that looks exceedingly like a curſe; and out of the ſame chriſtian diſpoſition and ſweetneſs of temper, you inform your readet that I have *partially repreſented hiſtory*; *diſguiſed and colour'd ancient authors*; *picked out what I like though but ill ſupported*; *dwell on every invidious circumſtance, and drop or ſuppreſs what might ſet it in a proper light*; *that my aim is to blacken and throw dirt*, p. 2. *that I am a crocodile, who firſt kill a man and then weep over him*; *that I give ſcraps of quotations*; *that venerable aſſemblies have not eſcaped the rancour of my pen*, p. 3. *that my comment is portentous*, p. 15. *that my reflections are invidious*, p. 18. *that I am deſtitute of ingenuity*, p. 20. *that my turns are illnatured*, p. 21. *that I am partial and ſophiſtical*, p. 22. *that I am not aſhamed with the virulency of my pen to put the noble confeſſors to freſh torture*, p. 26. *that I groſly abuſe my readers*, p. 28. *that I mix fiction and partiality*, p. 50. *that neither truth nor honeſty can be expected from me*, p. 56. *that I am arrived to ſuch an height of malice and love of calumny that the moſt abſurd and incredible charge ſhall ſtick*, p. 59.

that I have not a ſpark of ingenuity, or real ſenſe of honour, p. 61. and finally in a prophetick manner, that *the memory of the juſt* [Laud] *will be bleſſed, when the name of the wicked* [Chandler] *ſhall rot.* I could not help putting together theſe Eccleſiaſtical flowers, which you have preſented to the world, as a ſpecimen of your good manners and charity; and though when I firſt heard of your intentions to animadvert upon my introduction, I expected a treatment worthy your character as a ſcholar and divine, yet as I have been diſappointed in both theſe reſpects, you muſt pardon me if I treat you without ceremony, and pay the leſs complement to your profeſſion and title. To begin then.

You tell your reader, *that 'tis plainly Mr. C's deſign, under the odious name of perſecution, to decry and vilify all legal Eſtabliſhments of Religion.* p. 1. But did Mr. *C.* ever tell you ſo? or were you ever in the inſide of his heart? If not, you ſhould not have begun with an aſſertion that Mr. *C.* knows, 'tis in his power to convince, I will not ſay you, but all the equitable part of mankind of the untruth of. I have indeed written againſt perſecution. But doth this vilify all legal eſtabliſhments? Are then all legal eſtabliſhments inſeparably attended with perſecution? If not, my writing againſt the latter is no proof that my intention was to vilify the former. I have alſo very freely cenſured all eccleſiaſtical tyranny, and declared againſt ſetting up the prieſts as Lords

of

of the heritage, and making them kings in the room of the Son of God; becauſe whenever they have had their deſired power, their language hath been, *Up Iſrael to the prey*; and their practice, to *execute puniſhment upon the people, to bind their Kings with chains, and their nobles with fetters of iron.* Againſt ſuch tyrannical proceedings, againſt ſuch imperious prieſts, I will ever proteſt, whilſt I have a pen to write, and liberty to declare my ſentiments. But what is there in all this to vilify all legal Eſtabliſhments? Point out a ſingle paſſage of my introduction from whence this can be juſtly inferred, as you would not be eſteem'd a falſe accuſer. If an Eſtabliſhment was made upon my good Lord of *London*'s foundation *, upon ſuch *a fixed certain uniform rule of faith and practice, as could be embraced by all denominations of Chriſtians*; I know not a ſingle diſſenter in *England* that would be againſt it; and that ſuch an eſtabliſhment is practicable his Lordſhip hath abundantly demonſtrated, and actually laid down the very rule itſelf, a rule which, he tells us, the ſeveral denominations of Chriſtians do actually agree in. Now the nearer any eſtabliſhment comes to this, it comes nearer to perfection, and was ſuch a legal eſtabliſhment to take place, no reaſonable men would refuſe to enter into it. So that your two obſervations in favour of Eſtabliſhments ſhall remain in their full force, eſpecially as I ſhall leave you in poſ-

ſeſſion

* *Second Paſtoral Letter*, p. 24, 25.

ſeſſion of ſcarce any thing elſe, beſides your reproaches, throughout your whole pamphlet.

After this you prepare your reader, by many invectives againſt me, to expect a full triumph over me, and tell him, you *doubt not to convince every equitable reader, that whatever opinion we are to entertain of Mr.*C's *abilities, it muſt be with great abatement in point of candour and ingenuity.* p. 4.

To the firſt inſtance I appeal, who hath moſt. I ſay Biſhop *Alexander* was offended at the novelty of the expreſſions of *Arius*, and not able to bear ſuch an oppoſition from one of his presbyters to his own principles. The firſt of theſe aſſertions you qualify, the latter you deny. As to the firſt, I did not ſay, it was *merely* the novelty of the phraſe, as you put it, that gave offence, and ſo far your obſervation is impertinent; but only that the novelty did; which I need not prove, ſince you have not oppoſed it. As to the latter, you ſay, *it is an addition of mine own, without any grounds in the Hiſtorians; and that they no where tell us that he was of an high ſpirit, and impatient of contradiction.* But whether this be an addition of mine or not, without any grounds, let the following paſſage decide: " A certain " presbyter who had ingratiated himſelf " with *Conſtantia*, told her freely and com- " plained that *Arius* was unjuſtly baniſhed, " and excommunicated through the hatred " and private enmity of *Alexander*; for " that he was moved with envy againſt him p. 4, 5.

" for

" for his great reputation amongſt the peo-
" ple * ; " an evident intimation of his high ſpirit and impatience of contradiction. I muſt however own to you that this presbyter is ſaid to be a favourer of *Arius* ; but as the terms *Arian and Liar*, *Orthodoxy and Truth*, are not always equivalent, you muſt excuſe me from believing, like yourſelf, always on one ſide ; and eſpecially from rejecting the evidence of this presbyter, who appears to have been a man of reputation and virtue, by the honour he had of *Conſtantia*'s friendſhip and confidence. A farther proof of this prelate's imperiouſneſs and impatience of contradiction is this, that after he had heard the diſpute between *Arius* and others, in the council he collected for this purpoſe, and agreed himſelf to the doctrine of the *Conſubſtantiality*, he commands *Arius* to be of the ſame mind †. This is imperiouſneſs with a vengeance. But becauſe *Arius* could not, the Biſhop immediately excommunicates him Would you have a fuller proof of his impatience of contradiction ?

I

* Πρεσβυτερος τις — επαρρησιασατο προς αυτην και καλεμεμφετο, μη δικαιως Αρειον την παλειδα φυγειν — δια φθονον και ιδιας εχθρας εκβληθεντα παρα Αλεξανδρω — ευδοκιμουντα γαρ, εφη, παρα τω πληθει οφων αυτον εζηλοτυπησεν. Sozom. p. 484. Edit. Mogunt.

† Τον Αρειον ομοιως φρονειν εκελευσε. Sozom. p. 427.

I ſhould now have diſmiſſed this article, but only that I am willing to ſet you right in a paſſage of *Sozomen*, which you have miſtaken. You ſay the hiſtorians tell us, *that* Arius *had been excommunicated for ſiding* p. 4. *with the* Melitian *faction before* Alexander *came to the See.* But *Sozomen*, whom you cite for this, doth not ſay ſo. His account is this; that *Arius* had once ſided with the *Melitian* party, but that he afterwards forſook it, and was ordained Deacon by *Peter* Biſhop of *Alexandria*; and that he was excommunicated by *Peter*, not for ſiding with the *Melitians*, but for reproving *Peter* upon account of his excommunicating the *Melitians*, and rejecting their baptiſm. Now it is no conſequence that becauſe a perſon diſapproves of methods of ſeverity towards others, that therefore he ſides with them. *Arius* could not then be one of them, becauſe he had actually left them, and was a Deacon in the *Alexandrian* church, from which *Melitius* with his followers had divided.

Whether or no *Arius* was of a turbulent ſpirit, as you repreſent him, I leave others to judge. I think *Alexander* at leaſt as criminal in this reſpect as he, eſpecially as he excommunicated him, and all the clergy who were of his opinion; and wrote letters to the Biſhops every where not to communicate with thoſe who favoured him, though many of them were venerable for the apparent ſanctity of their lives.* *Hence*, ſays

 the

* Sozom. p. 427.

the hiſtorian, *they grew more eager and warm on both ſides, and the contention, as uſual, became greater.** In the written confeſſion which *Arius* afterwards delivered to *Conſtantine*, I am ſure he ſpeaks like a lover of peace; for after giving an account of his faith he ſays: Therefore we beſeech your Piety, that ſince we hold the faith of the Church and the Holy Scriptures, we may be again united to our Mother the Church; *that controverſies being taken away, and the unneceſſary diſputes which ariſe from them, we and the church may be at peace with each other.* As to his oppoſing the Biſhop out of revenge for his diſappointment, at not being promoted to the ſee of *Alexandria*, I ſee no authority for it but *Theodorit*, who appears to be an enemy to *Arius*, and therefore as incompetent a witneſs againſt *Arius*, as you think an *Arian* againſt one that is *Orthodox*. The account of *Socrates* is quite different, and much more probable; who tells us †, that *Arius*'s oppoſition to the Biſhop was occaſioned, by his apprehending that the Biſhop taught the opinion of *Sabellius*. *Conſtantine* alſo in his letter to *Alexander* and *Arius* dates the riſe of the controverſy from *Alexander*'s making inquiſition into his preſbyters ſentiments in impertinent queſtions; and to *Arius*'s imprudently ſpeaking of things he ought never to have thought of ‖. Now whether *Theodorit*'s ſingle

* Sozom. p. 485. † Socrat. p. 9.
‖ Euſeb. Vit. Conſtant. l. 2. c. 69.

ſingle teſtimony is to be preferred to the account given by *Socrates* and the Emperor, I ſubmit to every impartial perſon to determine.

The next fault you find with me is, that I have not tranſlated right the words ἀεὶ θεὸς ἀεὶ υἱός. To which all I have to anſwer is, that the words will bear my tranſlation as well as yours, and your tranſlation and mine agree in ſence; for if *God is always*, and *a Son always*, then it is true, *that God is ever God and ever a Son*; and I doubt not but you allow it to be ſound divinity to ſay, that *God is ever a Father and ever a Son*. But I will not contend with you about this. p. 5.

As to the explications you give about ἀναρχον γενεσιν and ἀγεννητογεννης, and ſuch like hard words, I have little concern about them; and ſhall only ſay, that if you can give any real ſenſe of ἀγεννητογεννης, *unbegottenly begotten*, or *ungeneratedly generated*, i. e. *begotten and not begotten, generated and not generated*, p. 7.

Eris mihi magnus Apollo.

If *Alexander* uſed theſe words *to guard againſt miſtakes*, he took in my opinion a very wrong method. For how miſtakes can be guarded againſt by nonſenſe and contradiction, is much above my poor comprehenſion.

But when you add *that whatever might be Alexander's meaning in a particular expreſſion*, p. 8.

it was not for disapproving it that Arius *was censured*; I must tell you that *Arius* expressly says the contrary in his letter to *Eusebius* of *Nicomedia*. These are his words, * *I must put you in mind that the Bishop greatly worries and persecutes us, and moves every weapon against us; so that he hath persecuted us out of the city as Atheists, because we dont agree with him, when he says* in publick amongst other things αγεννητογεννης *unbegottenly begotten.* You Sir may refuse for all that I know this evidence, though I confess I am so unfortunate, as not to believe that every thing *Arius* says is false, and every thing *Alexander* affirms is true.

p. 8. Your next remark is upon the sense of the words μεσίτευουσα φυσις, *a middle nature*, as I rendered them: You say the Bishop could only mean, a distinct *Hypostasis* or *Person* from the Father. But I think this could not possibly be his meaning. The whole passage runs thus: "The unskilful say, that "one of these two things must be, either "that the Son is out of nothing, or else "that there are two unbegotten things or "principles; being ignorant what a vast "difference there is between the unbegotten "Father, and the things created by him "out of nothing, both rational and irra-"tional;

* Οτι μεγαλως ημας εκπορθει και εκδιωκει και παντα καλων κινει καθ' ημων ο επισκοπος, ως τε και εκδιωξαι ημας εκ της πολεως ως ανθρωπους ασεβεις, επειδη ου συμφωνουμεν αυτω δημοσια λεγοντι ——— αγεννητογεννης εστιν. Theod. E. H. c. 5. p. 22, 22.

" tional; between both which, *viz.* God " and his creatures, is the only begotten " nature.* The argument is this, that it doth not follow either that the Son is out of nothing, or unbegotten, becauſe the Son is a middle nature between the unbegotten Father and the things produced by him out of nothing. This is ſomething like ſenſe, whereas if we tranſlate it in your way it will appear otherwiſe, and run thus: The only begotten perſon is a middle perſon between the perſon of the unbegotten Father, and the perſon of things created by him out of nothing. It is not therefore ſo very extraordinary that I ſhould mention this as an inſtance of the Biſhop's agreement with *Arius*; becauſe if *Arius* ſaid, what you cannot diſprove, that the Son was neither a part of God, nor out of any other thing that did exiſt, it muſt follow that *Arius* thought what *Alexander* affirmed, that the only begotten nature of the Son was a middle nature, between the unbegotten God, and the things produced by him out of nothing.

Thus we have diſmiſſed the article relating to the Biſhop. Now for his preſbyter. And as to him, with your uſual impartiality, p. 10. *Arius*

* Δυοιν πατερων λεγοντες δειν ειναι οι απαιδευτοι, η εξ ουκ οντων αυτον ειναι φρονειν, η παντως αγεννητα λεγειν δυο. αγνοουντες οι ανασχητοι, ως μαχεσαν αν ειη μεταξυ πατρος αγεννητου και των κτισθεντων υπ' αυτου εξ ουκ οντων, λογικων τε και αλογων· ων μεσιτευουσα φυσις μονογενης. Theod. p. 17.

Arius muſt be wrong, and *Alexander* right; becauſe, ſince the *Alexandrian* council condemned *Arius*, *it muſt be concluded, that he had perſonally aſſerted thoſe poſitions which are charged upon him*; or at leaſt we cannot ſuſpect any partiality in the council of *Nice*. You are greatly miſtaken in both in my opinion. I do not only ſuſpect them but charge them, with notorious partiality. *Arius* was a better judge of his own opinions than either of them, and he expreſsly denies the moſt invidious charges they would faſten on him, both in his letter to *Euſebius* of *Nicomedia*, and in that confeſſion of his faith which he preſented to the Emperour, and actually ſwore to his belief of. The ſame *Euſebius* alſo, and *Theognis* in their penitential letter to the Emperor aſſure him, that they did not ſubſcribe to the *Anathema* †, becauſe they did not believe that the perſon accuſed was ſuch a one as he was charged to be; and that they were fully perſuaded he was not, from his own letters which he wrote to them, and from ſeveral diſcourſes which they had with him in perſon. *Sozomen* doth indeed ſay that the council of *Nice* carefully examined into his aſſertions; but not one word that he publickly owned the tenets imputed to him by that council*. This the preſbyter before mentioned actually denied, aſſuring *Conſtantia* that the ſynod of *Nice* had injured him, and that he did not think as was reported of him. † And therefore till better proof, I am at liberty

p. 10.

ſtill

† Soc. p. 44. * Ib. p. 485. † Soc. p. 60.

ſtill to believe that they were the council's inferences, and not the aſſertions of *Arius*. Yea *Sozomen* ſeems to ſpeak doubtfully of this matter himſelf; for after he had been reckoning up ſome of the moſt obnoxious opinions aſcribed to him, he ſays, Κτισμα και ποιημα και αλλα πολλα α λεγειν εικος, ‖ which *it is probable* he ſaid.

You farther tell me, that you *cannot* p. 12. *underſtand by what rules of grammar Mr.* C. *tranſlates* αγεννητος γαρ ουκ ην, *there never was a time when he was unbegotten.* Mr. *C.* is not anſwerable for your want of underſtanding. Perhaps he never intended a literal tranſlation, but to expreſs what he apprehended to be his ſenſe. And I imagine he hath expreſſed it right. For the words ſeem to be made uſe of in oppoſition to the hard word Αγεννητογεννης, and to denote that as he was before all ages perfect and unchangeable God, ſo he was always begotten. For thus he ſays, before he was begotten, or made, or appointed, or founded, he was not; immediately ſubjoyning αγεννητος γαρ ουκ ην, for he was not unbegotten, *i. e.* before he was begotten or made, *&c. i. e.* there never was a time when he was unbegotten; and I think nothing can be plainer to a man that hath any underſtanding than this, that if Chriſt was not before he was begotten, there never was a time when he was unbegotten.

As to your ſuſpicions that *Arius* uſed the expreſſions περι χρονων, αναλλοιωτος, *&c.* in p. 13. an

‖ Soc. p. 426.

an evaſive manner, I ſhall ſay nothing to them. Suſpicions are endleſs and deſerve no reply. I ſhall only add, that *Arius* appears to be uniform and conſiſtent in his doctrine, and that there doth not ſeem any thing like reſerve or evaſion in his confeſſions. But I will not be anſwerable for all his followers.

p. 15. But what ſhall we do with the *portentous comment? Would any one*, ſay you, *ſuppoſe it poſſible for the wit of man, to make theſe two propoſitions:* The Son was not before he was begotten, *i. e.* he was from before all ages the begotten Son of God, *exegetical of one another.* Yes. The wit of half a man can do it, that looks upon the connection of the words in *Arius*'s letter. His firſt words are, υιος ουκ εστιν αγεννητος, *The Son is not unbegotten.* And the laſt are juſt the ſame. If then he *was not unbegotten*, he was I humbly conceive *the begotten Son of God.* So far there is no portentoſity in my comment. But how ſhall I come off about the words *before all ages?* Why *Arius* will help me here too. For in the middle of his confeſſion he ſays it expreſsly, that he was προ χρονων και αιωνων, *before all times and ages.* So that the portentoſity is not in my comment. A comment upon any propoſition may be juſt and regular, if the comment contain the true ſenſe of the propoſition though there ſhould be ſome addition to explain it, eſpecially if the addition be taken from the Author commented on. When you add, that I could *not decently own the*

true

true meaning, and therefore invented another, I ſhall only tell you, that I think I had no end to anſwer by concealing the true ſenſe, and that if I know myſelf I dare own the truth wherever I find it, though a child or an enemy ſhould tell it me; and even retract an errour when convinced of it.

And accordingly I allow you, that the p. 16. words of *Euſebius* you refer to in the next remark, do not literally ſignify the *riſe and progreſs of the affair* as I rendered them; but only that he had diligently examined, or as you will have it conſidered the riſe of it. Διαλογιζομαι ſignifies ſeriouſly and carefully to reaſon or think of, *i. e.* to examine a matter; and αρχην ſignifies the riſe or beginning of any thing. So that my tranſlation ſo far is true, that *Conſtantine* had diligently examined the riſe of the affair. And that he had as diligently examined the Progreſs of it is as true, though the particular paſſage referred to doth not mention it. And this any one may ſee who will read over the whole letter, as recorded by the hiſtorian *. In the mean time I pity the man that is ſo bare of ſubject matter of remark, as to take notice of ſuch trifles.

It is of ſomewhat more importance what p. 16. you add, that *Euſebius* and *Conſtantia*, who were friends of *Arius*, influenced *Conſtantine to write in that ſtrain of neutrality*, as you call it, in his letter to *Alexander*. I know, Sir, that there is no ſin greater in the opini-

* Euſeb. Vita Conſt. l. 2. p. 64, &c.

on of ſome men than this ſame neutrality; but as to others who place religion in practice, and not in mere orthodoxy as to diſputable opinions, and with whom moderation and forbearance are chriſtian virtues, you muſt give them leave to think, that whoever were the adviſers of that excellent letter, they were wiſe and prudent perſons, and that the advice itſelf was, as *Euſebius* calls it, αναγκαιοτατον, moſt neceſſary and ſeaſonable *; and that if *Hoſius* and others inſpired the Emperor with other ſentiments, and perſuaded him to attempt the cure of hereſy by perſecution inſtead of argument, they ſo far abuſed their intereſt in him, and were enemies to the church of God. But how will you prove that *Conſtantia* was ſo early the friend of *Arius*, as to have a hand in writing this letter to *Alexandria?* This letter was previous to the council of *Nice*, whereas *Conſtantia* doth not appear to have had any favourable opinion of *Arius* till conſiderably after, by means of one of her domeſtick chaplains. And even he did not openly profeſs his ſentiments, nor pretend to perſuade her to embrace any of the peculiar opinions of *Arius*, † but only that he was unjuſtly uſed by the council, and did not entertain the opinions commonly aſcribed to him. And in this ſhe believed what her chaplain aſſured her of. And that this was all ſhe endeavoured to perſuade her brother

* De Vita Conſt. l. 2. c. 63. † Ηξιωσθαι φασκων αυτον υπο της συνοδου, και μη δρομειν ως περι αιρεσεως λογος κατεχει. Soc. p. 60. Theod. p. 70.

brother *Conſtantine* † is evident from her dying words to him, in which ſhe diſcovers her apprehenſions of his being expoſed to ſome judgment, becauſe he had been perſuaded by certain perſons unjuſtly to puniſh with perpetual baniſhment men that were righteous and good, *viz* men who were falſely accuſed by the council of opinions they did not hold. So that as it doth not appear that *Conſtantia* was in *Arius*'s ſentiments, it is abſurd to imagine ſhe perſuaded the Emperor to write in a neutral ſtrain; eſpecially as 'tis not probable that ſhe had any favourable opinion of him till a conſiderable time after the letter was written. Nor doth it appear to have been written merely by the influence of *Euſebius* of *Nicomedia*; nonor, whilſt the Emperor was at *Nicomedia*, as you affirm, but as he was going from that city towards the Eaſt. For *Conſtantine* himſelf ſays, towards the cloſe of his letter, "Having been lately at the city of "*Nicomedia*, I immediately determined to "go into the Eaſt. And as I was now haſtening to you, and had travelled the greater "part of the journey to you, the news of "this affair was brought to me, and made "me alter my mind." A plain intimation that he was not at *Nicomedia* when he wrote it. And that he wrote it not by the influence

p. 5.

p. 7.

† Soz. p. 484.

* Πρωην ετυχας την Νικομηδεων πολιν —σπευδοντι δε μοι προς υμας ηδη, και τω πλειονι μερει συν υμιν οντι, η τωδε τι πραγματος αγγελια προς το εμπαλιν τον λογισμον ανεκαυτισεν—— ανοιξατε δη μοι λοιπον—της εως την οδον. Soc. p. 18.

of *Euſebius*, but that of *Hoſius* himſelf, ſeems probable to me; becauſe it is certain *Hoſius* whom the Emperor greatly loved and honoured, was preſent with him, and the propoſal employed by him to carry it to *Alexander* and *Arius*.

p. 17. I agree with you that the Emperor did not afterwards look upon the controverſy as a matter of ſmall importance But what was it that made him alter his opinion? It was the Biſhops, Sir. The perſecuting tyrannical Biſhops at *Nice*. They anathematized and damned their adverſaries, and excited the poor Emperor to baniſh and deſtroy them. They gave him an example by baniſhing *Arius* from *Alexandria*. It is methinks pity his Majeſty had not alſo approved of another project almoſt reſolved on by this venerable aſſembly, oppoſed by but one perſon as *Sozomen* * informs us; *viz.* That the Biſhops and Preſbyters, the Deacons and Subdeacons ſhould not lie with their wives, which they had married before their conſecration. What did the Holy Ghoſt depart in this point from the Holy Synod, and reſt only on *Paphnutius?*

p. 18. As to the reflection which I made, that the orthodox firſt brought in the puniſhment of hereſy with death, you ſay it is both *invidious and very extraordinary*. But it is not invidious becauſe it is true; and though you nibble at my authority you cannot diſpute it. It is an infamy that nothing can waſh them clean from; and ſuppoſing it was only made

* Soz. p. 437. Socrat. p. 39.

made *in terrorem*, yet it was an execrable and tyrannical law; and as the orthodox burnt the writings of the *Arians*, it is impoſſible for you to prove, that the Emperour, and they by whoſe perſuaſions he made it, never put it in execution. They did proceed to burning of books, and to damnation and baniſhments of mens perſons. And what could hinder ſuch men, when they had the power, from proceeding even to death? God Almighty of his infinite mercy grant that the clergy may never have the ſame power intruſted with them, in theſe free and happy kingdoms. The uſe they have made of it will never be forgotten.

You ſay, that *it is not the matter of your preſent inquiry, how far the eſtabliſhment of religion by penal laws and ſanctions, is to be juſtified, and when it deſerves to be branded with the odious name of perſecution.* But as I had charged the orthodox with firſt bringing in the puniſhment of hereſy with death, ſurely it could not have been improper to have paſſed ſome cenſure on ſo curſed and diabolical a practice, had you been againſt it. No. You intirely drop it, and ſeem rather to vindicate the thing itſelf, by calling my reflection invidious and extraordinary; becauſe, as you ſay, *it amounts to this, that the firſt chriſtian emperor being on the orthodox ſide, his laws, and the penalties enforcing them, were on the ſame ſide alſo.* As though thoſe laws and penalties were juſt; or ever the better for being on the ſide of Orthodoxy. But I wonder a man of p 17.

your

your ſagacity ſhould not have perceived that I had a quite different intention in that obſervation; *viz.* to ſhew that the orthodox firſt ſet up the trade of eccleſiaſtical butchery, and let looſe that outragious devil of perſecution even to death, which afterwards ſpread ſuch deſolations in the church of God, which one cannot read without trembling, nor relate without horrour.

p. 18. I have only one thing more to obſerve on this article; which is that it is ſurpriſing to me, that any man who hath read the eccleſiaſtical hiſtorians with any the leaſt care, ſhould affirm as you do, *that the ſanguinary law againſt thoſe who ſhould conceal any of* Arius's *books is mentioned only by* Sozomen; when it is not only related by *Socrates*, but the very imperial edict itſelf given us at large by him, of which this is the concluſion. "This therefore I in-"join, that if any one ſhould be found to "conceal any writing of *Arius*, and ſhall "not immediately bring it, and burn it in "the fire, his puniſhment ſhall be death. "For as ſoon as ever he ſhall be found in "this fault he ſhall undergo a capital pu-"niſhment." * You give me large occaſions of triumph, but I will ſpare you; only putting you in mind, that you are the moſt unfit perſon in the world to charge others with *groſs miſrepreſentations* of fact.

From

* Εκεινο μεντοι προαγορευω —— τουτω θανατωθεσαι η ζημια. παραχρημα γαρ αλως επι τουτω κεφαλικην υποσησεσθαι τιμωριαν. Soc. E. H. p. 32.

From the Emperor we paſs to the famous Council of *Nice*; and your firſt remark is, that *I throw dirt on the moſt venerable aſſembly of men that ever met ſince the days of the apoſtles*; which remark I do not think to be a very cleanly one. I have already proved them to be an aſſembly of perſecutors, and well wiſhers, moſt of them, to that infamous ſuperſtition of prieſtly celebacy; which hath, I am apprehenſive, been the occaſion of more adulteries, rapes, proſtitutions and leudneſſes of all kinds, than have ever been practiced in the publick ſtews. I have alſo proved from ſeveral authors, even thoſe who ſpeak the moſt favourably of them, ſuch as *Euſebius*, *Theodorit*, *Socrates* and *Sozomen*, that ſome were drawn to this council through the hopes των αγαθων of worldly profit, which I inſiſt on to be the true ſenſe of τα αγαθα; though I will allow you to tranſlate it *good days* if you pleaſe, if you will do me the like favour, by allowing what I have a thouſand inſtances to prove, that the clergy generally count thoſe the beſt days in which they obtain the greateſt power and riches; that others of them came to ſee ſuch a miracle of an Emperor, others of them to negotiate their own private affairs, to redreſs their grievances, to proſecute their enemies, and to be revenged of them. I have alſo proved from the ſame authors, that ſome of them were of a quarrelling malicious temper, and acted with a ſpirit of rancour and bitterneſs; and that as ſoon as they met together p. 19.

together they began with mutual reproache. and accuſations, and endeavoured to inflame the Emperor againſt each other, and wers hardly brought to the work of creed-making by the influence of his authoritye I have alſo repreſented that their enemies charge them with being generally a ſet of very ignorant men, and deſtitute of knowledge and learning. As the very friends of this council allow of moſt of theſe charges, I thought myſelf obliged impartially to repreſent them; and if we had the repreſentation of thoſe who were enemies to it, and injured by it, I doubt not but they would appear in a much worſe light than they do at preſent. The mention of theſe things

p. 26. you call *throwing dirt*, and *with the virulency of my pen putting thoſe noble confeſſors to freſh torture.* But I have tortured none that were true confeſſors, nor ſuppreſſed the teſtimony of the hiſtorians in their favour. I allowed you that they tell us, ſome were remarkable for their gravity, patience under ſufferings, modeſty, integrity, eloquence and other virtues. What would you have more? I ſuppoſe you would have had me *ingenuouſly ſuppreſſed* the evidence that there were others of a very different character, and been of the ſame mind with *Conſtantine**, who charitably declared, that if he ſaw a Biſhop committing adultery, he would cover the foul action with his purple, that it might give no offence

* Theod. p. 36.

fence to the beholders. But I am not yet convinced it is my duty to conceal the crimes of the clergy, when I am writing their hiſtory, and cannot allow that orthodoxy any more than hereſy ſhould be a cover for roguery and wickedneſs; and therefore as you own all my authorities to be good, I ſhall only make two or three remarks upon your obſervations on the council of *Nice*.

When I charge ſome of this council with coming to negotiate their own private affairs, and to redreſs their grievances, and be revenged of their enemies, you cry out, *Partial and ſophiſtical again!* p. 23. and ſophiſtically endeavour to ſoften this conduct, by tranſlating the words of *Sozomen*, Many of the prieſts came *as it were* to contend, *&c.* But all this daubing wont ſtick. *Sozomen* honeſtly puts them upon the foot of other aſſemblies; and ſays that this was like others. Οια δε φιλει γινεσθαι, *i. e.* according to common cuſtom, or as it generally happens, ſo here *many of the prieſts came together earneſtly to contend*,* or as though they had nothing elſe to do but earneſtly to contend about their own affairs; and the reaſon he gives for it is, becauſe *they imagined they had now a fit opportunity to redreſs their grievances*, viz. becauſe they had ſuch a miracle of an Emperor, who had been ſo condeſcending and kind to them. So far you cite the hiſtorian yourſelf. But why did you ſuppreſs what followed? I will ſupply your defects.

 The

* Αγωνιεσθαι συνελθοντες. Soz. p. 430.

The hiſtorian immediately ſubjoins: "Whatever matters any one had to accuſe the "others of, he delivered in his libel to the "Emperor, in which he gave an account "of all the injuries that were done him. "And this was their cuſtom almoſt every "day.*" So that here was no *as it were*, but real ſpleen and enmity and the ſpirit of revenge. It was the firſt work they went on, and what they brought on the carpet every day, and what therefore *many of the prieſts* muſt have had moſt at heart, and came principally for. As to *Euſebius*, from whom you ſay in the page, I did not relate the account, and in the margin that I did, he is not one jot more favourable to them, nor is it invidiouſly related. His words are, "Then "they began to accuſe thoſe who ſat near "them; they made their defences and re-"criminated, and that many things being "urged on one ſide and the other, many "altercations happened in the beginning; "and that it was not till after a great deal "of pains and patience that at laſt the "Emperor reconciled them." † So that accuſations, apologies, recriminations, defences, *&c.* was the firſt work entred upon by this holy ſynod, and argued many of them to be men of paſſionate, quarrelſome and revengeful ſpirits; which though you paſs by under the charge of *common frailty*, the Scripture calls by a harder name, and declares to be *the wiſdom that*

p. 24.

is

* Soz. p. 430.

† De Vita Conſtantini, l. 3. c. 13.

that is from beneath, which is earthly, ſenſual, deviliſh.

In the ſame page you are exceeding angry with me for my quotation from *Theodorit.* But without reaſon. I grant you that he doth ſpeak in favour of this council; nor did I ever deny it. But yet he ſays ſome of them were ſubtle and crafty, and of a quarrelſome malicious temper. This he aſſerts of thoſe *Arians* who were of the council, *Lib.* 1. *c.* 7. and intimates the ſame thing of ſome of the Orthodox, *Lib.* 1. *c.* 11. His words are theſe: "I do not think it juſt "to paſs it over in ſilence that there were "men * who were full, or lovers of en- "mity, who accuſed ſome of the Biſhops, "and delivered in their libels of accuſation "to the Emperor." The thing was too notorious to be quite omitted, though prudence directed him to conceal the numbers, and ſpeak as ſoftly as he could of their quarrels, and mutual hatreds. And I put theſe two chapters together in the quotation, that my reader might ſee I was impartial. And after a review of this whole matter, I ſee as many proofs at leaſt of ſubtleneſs and craftineſs, of malice and revenge in the orthodox party, as in the *Arian*, of which their frequent alterations of the Creed, and their treatment of their adverſaries are an abundant demonſtration. p. 24.

You farther add, under this article, that Mr. *Chandler is wrong in repreſenting them to* p. 26.

 have

* Φιλαπεχθημονες ανδρες εγκαλουσι των επισκοπων τινας. Theod. p. 36.

have begun to accuſe each other, after the Emperor had exhorted them to peace. It is hard that Mr. *C.* muſt never be right; but it is ſome ſatisfaction to him, that *Euſebius*, who lived ſome years before him, gives juſt the ſame account as he doth. Pray good Dr. let us conſult him. *Euſebius* then tells us, that after *Conſtantine* entered into the place where the council met, he made an oration to them, in which he tells them, that he had heard of their differences, was however glad to ſee them together, and ſhould obtain his wiſhes, *could he ſee them united together in their minds, and one common agreement among them all. This*, ſays he, *you who are conſecrated to God ought to be the miniſters of to others.* After this he paſſionately beſeeches them *to remove all cauſes of their mutual differences, all intricate matters of contention by the laws of peace.** Is not this an exhortation to peace? Well, what was the immediate conſequence? I am aſhamed to tell, but you force me, Sir. Why as ſoon as ever he had done, and gave them the liberty of ſpeech, they began to accuſe one another, and broke out into many contentions†. Surely you will allow me for once to be in the right.

p. 27. As to *Sabinus*'s charge I allowed you he was an heretick. This with you may be a reaſon for never believing him, but with no others but thoſe of your own complection;

* De Vita Conſtantini, l. 3. c. 12.
† Id. Ibid. c. 13.

tion; and though *Euſebius* was a learned man, yet it doth not therefore follow, that none of the reſt were ignorant and unlearned; and as *Sabinus* appeals to *Euſebius* for the truth of this that many of them were ſo, are you ſure that the ſame orthodox, who burnt the writings of the *Arians*, have ſuppreſſed no part of the character given by *Euſebius* of the perſons who compoſed this council? Or do you believe in your conſcience, that out of ſo great a number as met together at *Nice*, there were no *Yea and Nay men*, who followed the majority and voted as they were bid? I ſhall only add, that when *Socrates* argues *ex hypotheſi*, that if they were a ſet of ignorant illiterate men, yet they were enlightned by the Holy Ghoſt, and ſo could not err from the truth, it is a kind of an allowance that they were not ſome of them overburthened with learning and knowledge. For what need of inſpiration if they had knowledge enough without it? If they were inſpired, it muſt be becauſe they did not underſtand thoſe things which they received the knowledge of by divine illumination. Of conſequence the allowing them to be inſpired is a confeſſion of their ignorance; and my repreſenting it in this light is no miſrepreſenting of my hiſtorian, nor abuſe of my readers.

There are many pages which follow which do not in the leaſt affect the truth of my hiſtory, and in which therefore I have no concern; and therefore I ſhall only make one ſhort obſervation upon them, *viz.* that if the

council

council had intended the peace of the church, they ought to have made the creed as wide and extenſive as they could, and not to have inſerted the moſt exceptionable phraſes they could invent, as they actually did, and which with all your winding and twiſting you have not diſproved.

I now proceed to *Page* 40. In which you give us an inſtance of your ſkill in criticks, and another of your knowledge in hiſtory. I had aſſerted that the creed was altered and amended. You learnedly anſwer, *there was no alteration made in the doctrine of the creed, but only ſome explications added.* As though the addition of ſeveral explications was no alteration of the creed. Again, I had affirmed, that five Biſhops were diſpleaſed with the word *Conſubſtantial*, and made many objections againſt it. You reply, that *of the five Biſhops our author mentions there were only three at moſt that refuſed to ſign the Conſubſtantiality, and that the other two*, Euſebius *of* Nicomedia, *and* Theognis *of* Nice *did actually ſubſcribe it, and only rejected the Anathema's ſubjoined.* This author well perceives the contempt with which you treat him, but he gives you now to underſtand, that he cannot imagine who ſet you upon burning your fingers by dabbling in eccleſiaſtical hiſtory; and he affirms that there were five Biſhops, *viz. Euſebius* of *Nicomedia*, *Theognis* of *Nice*, *Maris* of *Chalcedon*, *Theonas* of *Marmarica*, and *Secundus* of *Ptolemais*, who would not ſubſcribe the word *Conſubſtantial*, and that amongſt theſe

five

five two of them, *viz. Euſebius* of *Nicomedia*, and *Theognis* of *Nice* were actually baniſhed for it. Let *Socrates* determine between your knowledge and veracity as an hiſtorian and mine. His words are: "Five "only would not receive the creed, finding "fault with the word *conſubſtantial*, (viz. "the five juſt mentioned) for they ſaid the "word *conſubſtantial* muſt mean, that which "is from another, either by diviſion, or "fluxion, or projection. By projection, as "a twig from its roots; or by fluxion, as "children from the father; or by diviſi-"on; as two or three gold veſſels from the "ſame maſs. But the Son is like nothing "of theſe things; and therefore they ſaid "that they would not give their aſſent to "this faith," and therefore ſcoffing greatly "at the word *conſubſtantial*, they would not "ſubſcribe to the depoſition of *Arius*——— "And therefore by a mandate of the Em-"peror, *Euſebius* and *Theognis* were ba-"niſhed. Upon this *Euſebius* and *Theognis* "a little while after their baniſhment, de-"livered an inſtrument of their repentance, "ſignifying their agreement with the faith "of the conſubſtantiality." * Here, Sir, is full evidence of my aſſertion, and if this was a proper place I could eaſily reconcile this account with the ſeemingly different one given by *Sozomen*. You may ſee by this how little poſitiveneſs becomes any writer, eſpecially in an affair in which he allows there is

* Soc. p. 23.

is ſome perplexity. It is true, they ſay in their penitential letter to the Emperor, that they *agreed and ſubſcribed to the faith, but not to the Anathema*, * not, as you affirm, that they actually had ſubſcribed, or pleaded their ſubſcription to the Conſubſtantiality; for that they did refuſe to ſubſcribe it at firſt and were baniſhed for it, the evidence of *Socrates* is plain and full.

p. 41. The next thing you complain of, is, that *there is a ſort of Men with whom ill-natured ſuſpicions will paſs for clear demonſtration*, becauſe I ſay that *Conſtantine* ſaw into their tempers, *&c.* Had what I ſaid been founded on mere ſuſpicion, you might have juſtly ſaid it was ill-natured. But ſure all equal and impartial judges will allow, that as *Conſtantine* had been himſelf witneſs to their quarrels, and mutual accuſations, and revengeful ſpirit, his advice to them at parting was founded not on ſuſpicion only, but plain demonſtration. *But what could our author mean by that ſneering expreſſion of his filling their pockets?* Why he meant by it, what he thought you would not have been angry with, *That he filled their pockets*, that he τοις προσηκουσι δωροις ετιμησεν, † honoured them with proper gifts, or as *Euſebius* ſays, μεγαλοψυχως εκαστον — τιμων ξενιοις, ‡ he *magnificently* honoured every one with preſents. And as I found fault neither with the feaſt or the preſents, why ſhould you, or where is the ſneer of mentioning it? Had they feaſted

* Soc. p. 43, 44. † Soz. p. 438.
‡ Euſeb. Vit. Conſtant. l. 3. c. 16.

feaſted oftner, and met together for no other account but feaſting, I think they would have done much leſs miſchief, than they did by hatching creeds, and coyning hard words, which they themſelves never knew how to explain, and which others could not underſtand. So that I hope you will not think me ſo heterodox for the future, as to imagine that I am an enemy to the feaſtings of the clergy.

Upon the whole I ſhall conclude this head with Mr. *Limborch*'s account of this famous ſynod. "Such was the fierce and "reſtleſs ſpirit of the Biſhops met toge- "ther at *Nice*, ſo many and bitter their "contentions, that forgetting the princi- "pal cauſe of their meeting together, they "meanly preſented accuſations againſt each "other to the Emperor. — Who can be- "lieve that an aſſembly of men, inflamed "with paſſion and mutual hatred, and "breathing nothing but revenge, would "reſt contented with procuring only the "condemnation of their hated enemies, "and not uſe their utmoſt endeavours to "excite the Emperor to baniſh thoſe "whom they had condemned?" Strange character of the moſt venerable aſſembly of men, that ever met ſince the days of the Apoſtles, as you call them! What is this Mr. *Limborch*'s way of throwing dirt too? Are not his characters of men to be truſted no more than mine? I am in pain

* *Hiſtory of the Inquiſition*, Vol. I. p. 12.

for his character of the bleſſed Martyr *Laud.*

p. 43. Your next article is *Euſebius*, under which you ſay, *it is due to him in common juſtice, that his reaſonings ſhould be fully ſtated*; adding, *he doth not mean, that all uſe of unſcriptural words would occaſion differences, but only thoſe in particular uſed by* Arius. Suppoſing this to be true, where is the pertinence of this remark, or how doth it affect my argument? I expreſsly ſay, that the anathema forbids only the unſcriptural words of *Arius*; and my argument is, that if the introducing the unſcriptural words of *Arius* had occaſioned differences and diſturbances, and therefore ought to be rejected; in like manner the unſcriptural words of the orthodox ought for the ſame reaſon to have been rejected, becauſe they were the occaſions of as many differences and diſturbances. And do you weaken the force of this arguing if you can. I muſt therefore ſtill inſiſt that the behaviour of *Euſebius* was inconſiſtent, in rejecting the unſcriptural words of one party, and adopting the unſcriptural words of the other; eſpecially as he knew the word *conſubſtantial* was an exceeding difficult one, and as to the meaning of which the very Biſhops could not agree, even after they had agreed to inſert it into their creed. *

Next to *Euſebius* comes your hero *Athanaſius*, whom you ſeem to think as unworthily

* See Soc. E. H. p. 58.

thily accuſed as our bleſſed Saviour himſelf and to have always worn a ſpotleſs robe of innocence. I had ſaid, that he was accuſed to the Emperor by many Biſhops and Clergymen, who declared themſelves orthodox, of being the Author of all the ſeditions in the Church. You reply, *Yes, his accuſers were ſuch as declared themſelves orthodox*; and all that you have to object againſt them is that they were *ſchiſmaticks*, and bitter enemies to *Athanaſius*. What then? Can a ſchiſmatick never be orthodox in the faith, or ſpeak truth? And was not *Athanaſius* as bitter an enemy to the *Melitians* and *Arians*, as they were to him? If then the charges of either ought to be credited, why not of the *Melitians?* And *Athanaſius* will ſtand condemned of this firſt charge if you have no better arguments to clear him, than that his accuſers were ſchiſmaticks, and ſuch as you and he counted his enemies. But how doth *Athanaſius* clear himſelf of the crimes of ſeditions, murthers, and ſacriledge? Why thus, ſay you: He *inſiſted that the* Melitians *were irregularly ordained, and heterodox in the faith, and highly injurious to thoſe who thought rightly of the nature of God.* Ridiculous. As though to recriminate was to juſtify one's ſelf; or calling a man an heretick would render him incapable of becoming an evidence againſt an incendiary or murtherer. The accuſation againſt *Athanaſius* was for ſedition, murther and ſacriledge, Sir, and an accuſation *brought by many Biſhops and Clergymen*; and you have but

p. 44.

p. 45.

very poorly helped him out of the ſcrape, by telling your reader, that he clearly defended himſelf againſt two other accuſations, which I did not ſo much as mention. Nay it appears that the Emperor himſelf found the evidence againſt him ſtrong, in that he was at a Loſs what Deciſion to make; and commanded *Athanaſius* to prevent any future occaſions of ſuch diſturbances, by receiving all to communion under pain of baniſhment. But you are offended in that I charged him with ALL *the ſeditions, &c.* and you will have it only with ſome. But had you read the whole paſſage in the hiſtorian, perhaps you might have been of my mind. They accuſe him, ſays he, to *Conſtantine*, as the cauſe of the ſeditions and diſturbances in the church, and as driving away thoſe who were willing to enter into it, *whereas all would agree if this one thing was granted.* * Now he who prevents all from agreeing, by abſolutely denying the one thing that would unite them, may juſtly be ſaid to occaſion all thoſe ſeditions and diſturbances, which are the conſequence of ſuch a denial.

P. 46. The next charge, *viz.* that *Athanaſius* ſpirited up a woman to charge *Euſebius* with getting her with child, you ſay is *an inſtance of moſt amazing impudence in the hiſtorian, and partiality in the relater.* Not ſo faſt good Doctor. How is it you prove the hiſtorian's

* Παντας ομονοειν, ει τουτο μονον συγχωρηθειη. Soz. p. 473.

hiſtorian's amazing impudence? Why firſt, *he was a bigot to* Arianiſm, and therefore *ever ready to ſupport it by lies and fiction.* Secondly, he is *given up on all hands as an inaccurate and partial writer.* Thirdly, *his ſtory is the reverſe of* Ruffinus's, *and wholly unatteſted by all other evidence.* But I anſwer, if *Philoſtorgius* was a bigot to Arianiſm, *Athanaſius* and his friends were bigots to orthodoxy, and therefore ſo far as bigottry is concerned deſerve no more credit than *Philoſtorgius.* And as to his lies and fictions, I would adviſe you to be ſilent upon that head, becauſe ſome of the holy orthodox fathers were themſelves a little criminal this way. As to his being inaccurate and partial, perhaps he might have appeared otherwiſe had we been favoured with his eccleſiaſtical hiſtory at length; and as for the extracts we have of him from *Photius*, every one who conſiders the virulence with which his abridger every where treats him, will I imagine be apt to think, that that abridgment is not always accurate and impartial. And laſtly, though the relation from *Philoſtorgius* be unatteſted by all other evidence, this is no ſure proof that it had no ground at all. For it is not to be ſuppoſed that the orthodox would tell the ſtory to the diſadvantage of *Athanaſius*; and as to the *Arians*, the orthodox have taken care to ſuppreſs all evidence from that ſide, by deſtroying thoſe writings which contained it. p. 46, 47, 48.

As to *Athanaſius*'s ordination to the biſhoprick of *Alexandria*, which I ſaid was cenſured as clandeſtine and illegal, you merrily reply, *His Ordination cenſured? But by whom? By Mr.* Chandler *perhaps and ſuch as he. He was accuſed if you will, and if he could have been convicted, no doubt he had been cenſured.* I ſuppoſed they who accuſed him cenſured him, which was all that I meant. But if you do not like the word *cenſured*, take that of *accuſed*. Now by whom was he accuſed? Why, ſome charged him with one crime, ſome with another; but all of them in common charged him with coming to his biſhoprick by the perjury of his ordainers, and that he was ſo far from ſatisfying them upon this head, when they deſired it of him, that he uſed violence towards them, and threw them into jayl. And whether the evidence produced for theſe and other crimes was ſo ſtrong, or from whatever other cauſe it proceeded, yet απροσδοκητοι και των νομιζομενων φιλων ανεφυοντο κατηγοροι *, ſome of thoſe who were eſteemed his friends became unexpectedly his accuſers. Of theſe accuſers ſeveral were Biſhops; and as to the truth of the accuſation, the *Arians* ſeem generally to have believed it †; who aſſerted, that *Athanaſius* was clandeſtinely ordained by ſeven Biſhops, contrary to the opinion of all the reſt, in direct violation of their oath; and that for this reaſon many of the *Egyptian*

p. 48.

* Soz. p. 480. † Ibid. p. 466.

gyptian laity and clergy would not communicate with him. If theſe accuſations had not been againſt an orthodox ſaint, and made by men ſuſpected of hereſy or ſchiſm, they would be allowed by all impartial men to carry ſome weight, and to juſtify my aſſertion that his ordination to the biſhoprick of *Alexandria* was cenſured as illegal. And though *Gregory Nazianzen*, who was an *Athanaſian* perſecutor, and the *Alexandrian* ſynod, which was of *Athanaſius*'s party, maintain the contrary; yet as here is oppoſite evidence, the impartial reader muſt judge for himſelf in a matter of this uncertainty; always remembring that this matter might have been ſet in a clearer light, had we had any of the writings of the *Arians* to have conſulted on this occaſion.

But farther when I ſaid, ſome of the crimes objected to him, he cleared himſelf from, and as to others he deſired more time for his vindication, you cry out: *What mixture of partiality and fiction is here!* But, Sir, here is no mixture of fiction and partiality. Some of the crimes I allowed he cleared himſelf of. Do you charge me with partiality on this account? I ſuppoſe not, but for ſaying that as to others he deſired more time for his vindication. As to this you *are at a loſs to find any thing like it in the hiſtorians.* But I cannot help your negligence or ignorance. I will find it for you, and quote chapter and verſe for your conviction. It is in *Sozomen*, p. 480. *Athanaſius* P. 50.

naſius being commanded to make his defence came oftentimes to the place of trial. Some of the accuſations he cleared himſelf from: των δε, προς επισκεψιν υπερθεσιν ητησεν; as to others he demanded more time, a farther delay, in order to conſider them. Is this fiction?

p. 52, &c. As to the three next articles you ſay nothing to the purpoſe, by producing *Athanaſius* and *Theodorit*, againſt the plain aſſertions of the council; and I am not afraid to truſt it with every impartial man to determine who are moſt worthy of credit; eſpecially when he hath conſidered the following paragraph.

I took on me to aſſert, that when *Euſebius* and others laid the whole matter before *Conſtantine*, he altered his ſentiments with reſpect to the tranſactions of the council of *Tyre*, confirmed the depoſition of *Athanaſius*, and baniſhed him into *France*. Upon this paſſage, you thus remark. *But did* Euſebius *then* and others *lay the whole matter before the Emperor; and by that means get the ſentence of the council confirmed? What truth or honeſty can we expect from the man that ſhall affirm it?* To this cruel queſtion I ſhall make no other anſwer, but that your truth and honeſty or mine are at ſtake. I appeal to my author. It is *Sozomen*, p. 488. His words are theſe: *Thoſe who were of* Euſebius's *party went to the Emperor, and aſſerted that the ſynod of* Tyre *had done juſtly in their ſentence againſt* Athanaſius; *and produced* Theognius, Maris, Theodorus, Valens

lens *and* Urſatius *as witneſſes that* Athanaſius *had broken the ſacred cup; and reproaching him,* as the orthodox hiſtorian calls it, *with many other things, they prevailed by their accuſations. Upon which the Emperor, whether he believed the truth of theſe things, or at leaſt thought that the biſhops would agree if* Athanaſius *was baniſhed, commanded him to depart unto* Treves *in* France. I imagine both theſe reaſons prevailed on the Emperor to take this ſtep; but that the former did, *viz.* his believing the accuſations againſt *Athanaſius* to be true, is as evident as hiſtory can make it. For the ſame author tells us, *p.* 491, 492. That the people of *Alexandria* crying out and praying for the return of *Athanaſius*, *Antony the Great* wrote oftentimes in his favour; urging that he (the Emperor) ought not to believe the *Melitians*, but to look on their accuſations as mere calumnies. But the Emperor was not thus to be perſuaded, but wrote to the *Alexandrians, and charged them with madneſs and ſedition*, commanding the clergy and nuns to be quiet; * affirming that he could not alter his opinion, nor recall *Athanaſius, being condemned by an eccleſiaſtical judgment, as an exciter of ſedition.* He alſo wrote to monk *Antony*, telling him, it was impoſſible he ſhould diſregard the ſentence of the

* Και μη μεταλιθεσθαι της γνωμης ισχυριζετο, μη δε μετακαλεισθαι τον Αθανασιον, ως κατεγνωσμενον. και εκκλησιαστικη καταδεδικασμενον κρισει. Soz. l. 2. c. 3.

council. For, ſays he, *though a few might paſs judgment through hatred or affection, yet it was not probable that ſuch a large number of famous and good biſhops ſhould be of ſuch a ſentiment or diſpoſition; for that* Athanaſius *was an injurious and inſolent man, and the cauſe of diſcord and ſedition.* This is evidence as full as can be deſired, that the Emperor had a fuller and truer account of the tranſactions of the council of *Tyre* than *Athanaſius* had given him. And what is very remarkable is, that *Athanaſius* appears to have been at *Conſtantinople* at this very time, and to have had the liberty of making his complaints before his enemies, which he had deſired, and which the Emperor himſelf allowed as reaſonable, in his letter to the council. And yet the ſaint could not make his innocency appear, even when he had no reaſon to complain of the partiality of his judges, nor of any iniquitous meaſures to oppreſs and condemn him. For notwithſtanding he had endeavoured to prejudice the Emperor againſt what they had done, yet thoſe prejudices immediately wore of when a more impartial report was made to him; he confirmed their tranſactions, commended them as a ſet of wiſe and good Biſhops,

* Αντωνιω δε ανλεδηλωσε, μη οιος τε ειναι, της συνοδε υπεριδειν την ψηφον. ει γαρ και ολιγοι, φησι, προς απεχθειαν η χαριν εδικασαν, α δηπου πιθανον τοσαυτην πληθυν ελλογιμων και αγαθων επισκοπων της ομοιας γινεσθαι γνωμης. τον γαρ Αθανασιον υβριστην τε ειναι και υπερηφανον και δι-χονοιας και στασιως αιτιον. Soz. ibid.

Biſhops, and cenſured the ſaint as a ſeditious inſolent and injurious perſon, and on theſe accounts ſent him into the baniſhment he deſerved. I do not however deny, what *Socrates* ſays, that his being farther accuſed with threatning to ſequeſter the imperial revenues, might add to the Emperor's reſentment, and confirm him in his opinion of his inſolence and impudence. Upon the whole I would adviſe you to meddle no more with eccleſiaſtical hiſtory, or if you do, *Take care and remember* SOZOMEN. What you add, that the *Alexandrian* coun- p. 44. cil and the Younger *Conſtantine* excuſe this ſentence of the Emperor as intended for his better ſecurity, carries in it not the leaſt air of probability, after ſo expreſs a declaration from himſelf that he baniſhed him for his inſolence and ſedition.

And from hence it appears that the charge of *Athanaſius*'s threatning to ſtop the corn that was yearly ſent to *Conſtantinople* from *Alexandria*, is neither abſurd or incredible. You indeed with your uſual ſpleen cry out, *To ſuch an heighth of malice,* p. 59. *to ſuch a love of calumny is this author now arrived, that any charge ſhall ſtick that is levelled againſt* Athanaſius *be it ever ſo abſurd or incredible.* If you were not above advice, Sir, I would intreat you to look at home, and ſee whether theſe are not the very diſpoſitions that too much influence your own heart. However, this charge againſt *Athanaſius* hath but too good a foundation. It was an accuſation of Biſhops. You ſay

magiſterially, *moſt probably they were of the* Melitian *faction.* But you have ſaid nothing to prove it; and therefore they might be of the orthodox faction. *They were ſuch as* Socrates intimates *were worthy of credit*, which you do not really deny; only you add, that the hiſtorian ſays immediately, that *by this means the Emperor was circumvented or carried away*; *and that this proves* Socrates *believed nothing of the truth of it.* I know not what *Socrates* thought himſelf; but there is no intimation, that he thought the Emperor *was circumvented or carried away*, as you and the latin tranſlation render it. His words are: τυτω γαθ συναρπαγεις ο βασιλευς και εις θυμον αχθεις, the Emperor was hereby hurried away, and excited to anger; to denote the greatneſs of his diſpleaſure, and not his being deceived by fraud; and therefore *the credit he aſcribes to the accuſers was*, not as you affirm, *what their office and ſtation might give them with unthinking people*, but what their office and veracity actually gave them with the Emperor himſelf. Upon the whole, as this ſtory ſuits well with the turbulent ſeditious temper of *Athanaſius*, and as the hiſtorian ſays nothing to diſcredit it, but intimates that thoſe who charged him with it were worthy of credit, and as the Emperor himſelf knew him to be an inſolent ungovernable man, and actually baniſhed him for this amongſt other crimes, and could never be perſuaded to recall him; this charge againſt him will ſtick,

till

till you can find ſome more powerful means to take it off.

As to the ſelling of the corn that was given for the ſupport of the poor of the church of *Alexandria*, and putting the money in his own pocket, which *Athanaſius* was accuſed of; You reply, *Yes*; *he was accuſed: And what then? So was our bleſſed Saviour accuſed of blaſphemy and treaſon.* Would you intimate hereby, that he was as innocent of the crimes charged on him as Chriſt was? You will find it a difficult matter to prove it. I allow you that ſome *Egyptian* biſhops did affirm in their letter to pope *Julius*, that the things charged on *Athanaſius* were falſe. But ſhould you not have told your reader, that the ſame hiſtorian relates in the ſame place, that the council of *Antioch*, which conſiſted at leaſt of ninety Biſhops, ſent alſo letters of a quite contrary ſtrain to the ſame pope? And though *Athanaſius* ſays that the poor made no complaint of ſuch embezzlement, but received the ſame benevolence as uſual, you muſt excuſe me from believing *Athanaſius* in his own cauſe, eſpecially as the Emperor believed the fact, and threatned *Athanaſius* with death for it. It is true *Conſtantius* did at the inſtances of his brother *Conſtans* recall him from baniſhment; you add, *though as it ſeems unwillingly*; and that had I *any ſpark of ingenuity or real ſenſe of honour, I ſhould have repreſented the one part as well as the other.* What ſhould I have repreſented? p. 60. p. 61.

ſented? What that *Conſtantius* recalled him? I will then to retrieve my honour relate the manner of it impartially. You yourſelf allow, that he did it, *as it ſeems, unwillingly*. As it ſeems! As though there was any room to queſtion it. The truth is, that *Conſtans* threatned his brother with war if he would not recall *Athanaſius* and *Paulus*. Upon this *Conſtantine* ſummoned a great number of the *Eaſtern* biſhops, acquainted them with the choice his brother had given him, and aſked their advice how he ſhould act. Their anſwer was, that *it was better to reſtore the churches to* Athanaſius's *party, than occaſion a civil war* *. And upon this neceſſity *Conſtantius* conſented. So that the recalling of *Athanaſius* was a mere act of force upon the Emperor, and extorted from him, not by any conviction of the ſaint's innocency, but by the menaces of his brother, and the apprehenſions of a civil war, which there is too much reaſon to think *Athanaſius* excited *Conſtans* to, in order to recover his biſhopricrick. When you add, that *he was acquitted by the* Weſtern *Biſhops, who could judge with much leſs partiality and prejudice*; I confeſs I cannot be of your mind. Why with leſs partiality? What becauſe they were othodox? Or becauſe they were better informed? By whom? Why by *Athanaſius* and his party; who with you are in all caſes authentick evidences,

* Soz p. 106, 107.

evidences, whatever proofs can be produced to the contrary. The *weſtern* biſhops were all under the influence of the popes of *Rome*; and one of the reaſons why *Julius*, who was then pope, condemned the council of *Antioch* which had deprived *Athanaſius*, was this, that they had not called him to the council *. An admirable proof of his impartiality and freedom from prejudice, and of theirs who acted under his influence!

As to *Athanaſius*'s *Alexandrian* ſynod, I intended no more than that the conſubſtantiality of the Spirit with the Father and Son was here firſt ſynodically aſſerted, and ſtamped as the orthodox doctrine. And as you allow this I have no farther concern with your remarks. p. 62.

As to the council of *Conſtantinople*, which is your next general head, your firſt remark is upon the ſlip you imagine I have made in chronology; and from hence, you ſhrewdly obſerve, *one would ſuſpect that Mr.* Chandler *hath not been much converſant in theſe matters, but hath now only looked on this part of hiſtory, on purpoſe to rake together dirt and ſcandal.* A very candid ſuſpicion truly, and *worthy the worthy Rector of St. Andrew's Underſhaft.* You know however every man muſt have a beginning, and if I am ſuch a novice in eccleſiaſtical hiſtory, methinks you ſhould have treated me with p. 64. p. 65.

a

* Soz. p. 510.

a little more good nature and mercy; though young and unexperienced as I am, I am apt to think I have cut out work enough for the Doctor. As to the date of the council, you ſhould know, that learned men differ about it, and that I have the liberty to follow my own judgment in this affair. And as to the council itſelf I have done them but juſtice, when I call them the creatures of *Theodoſius*, and ſay they were convened to do as he bid them, *i. e.* to confirm the *Nicene* faith. And ſo ſay *Socrates* and *Sozomen*.* He called together a ſynod of biſhops who were of his own opinion, βεβαιοτητος τε ενεκα των εν νικαια δοξαντων, for the ſake of confirming the decrees of the council of *Nice*. So that you have more than my naked aſſertion that they were an aſſembly of men that were at the Emperor's diſpoſal, and ready to do what he bid them. Thus far I ſtand pretty clear: But alas for me! I have unluckily ſuggeſted a fact in confutation of myſelf. In one place I ſay the council was all of the Emperor's own party, and in another that there were thirty ſix of the *Macedonian* party. Unlucky aſſertion indeed! However it appears by the hiſtory that the Emperor firſt intended to call only a ſet of biſhops of his own ſtamp; for the confirmation of the *Nicene* creed was evidently the main job to be done. Accordingly about

* Soc. p. 264. Soz. p. 711.

about one hundred and fifty of this complexion met together. To theſe were added thirty-ſix of the *Macedonian* party, a number trifling in compariſon with the other, and which would juſtify the expreſſion that the council was all of his own party; eſpecially as they ſoon broke up from the council, and ſo left them litterally all creatures of his majeſty, and entirely of his own party. And being thus left alone, they confirmed the *Nicene* faith, ordained *Nectarius* Biſhop of *Conſtantinople*, and decreed theſe excellent things: * *viz.* that all hereſies ſhould be condemned, and that the biſhop of *Conſtantinople* ſhould take place next after the biſhop of *Rome*. So that this council were ALL of the Emperor's party, notwithſtanding my unlucky hint about the *Macedonians*. There is nothing worth my taking notice of in your two next remarks.

I now proceed to your laſt article, *the great and good, the bleſſed Martyr* Archbiſhop *Laud*. But in what cauſe was he a martyr? For the purity of religion, the unblameableneſs of his life, or the liberties of his country? No: If he was a martyr, it was for ſuperſtition in worſhip, power and riches in the prieſts, and arbitrary government in the prince. On theſe accounts the high church clergy adore his memory, and offer incenſe to him as a ſaint. But do you really think there is p. 70.

* Soz. p. 714.

one Man in *Great Britain*, beſides the prieſts of his own complection, that think him either a martyr or a ſaint? A ſaint! and yet a rigid, bitter perſecutor, and who drove his royal maſter into ſuch extreams, as involved the nation in a civil war, and brought the unhappy king himſelf at laſt to the block. A ſaint! that crops off mens ears, and ſlits their noſes, and mangles their bodies with ſtripes; and in his private retirement reflects on it with pleaſure, and records it in his diary. It puts me in mind, that there are *ſome perſons worſe than crocodiles, who can kill men, without ſhedding a tear at their deſtruction.**

The charges I brought againſt him, are I confeſs great and many. But then they are ſupported by evidence as clear and ſtrong as can be deſired. As to his being popiſhly inclined, you ſay it is *ſenſeleſs*; but yet you cannot deny what I aſſerted, that he was ſo much a friend to the popiſh faction, that whilſt he perſecuted the proteſtants, who could not run all his lengths in doctrine and ceremonies, he greatly favoured the *Roman* catholicks: And though I am intirely againſt perſecuting them upon a religious account, yet how unbecoming the character of a proteſtant biſhop is it, to oppreſs, impriſon, and harraſs proteſtants for trifles, and at the ſame time to protect and countenance papiſts, thoſe ſworn enemies to the proteſtant

p. 72.

* Berriman's *Remarks*, p. 3.

ſtant religion and liberties. That your bleſſed martyr did this is allowed by his friends and enemies. *L'Eſtrange*, whom undoubtedly you will not charge with partiality againſt him, ſays of him: *The Archbiſhop of* Canterbury *ſtands aſperſed in common fame as a great friend at leaſt and patron of the* Romiſh *Catholicks, if he were not of the ſame belief. To which I anſwer by conceſſion: True it is he had too much and long favoured the* Romiſh *faction* —— *though not the* Romiſh *faith. He tampered indeed to introduce ſome ceremonies bordering upon ſuperſtition, diſuſed by us, and abuſed by them. From whence the* Romaniſts *collected ſuch a good diſpoſition in him to their tenets, as they began not only to hope, but in good earneſt to cry him up for their proſelyte* *. You ſee, Sir, he went ſuch lengths as made the papiſts imagine him their own; and though his conference with *Fiſher* the Jeſuit afterwards proved he differed from them in ſome doctrinals, yet as he avowed and practiſed the moſt infamous and curſed part of popery; I mean, Sir, perſecution for conſcience ſake, he was a papiſt in the worſt ſenſe of that word.

Beſides, as piety and the care of religion is a neceſſary ingredient in my judgment to the character of a martyr; I am at a loſs how to reconcile part of the Archbiſhop's conduct with my notion of religion

* Ruſhworth, Vol. III. p. 1326.

gion and piety. The forementioned hiſtorian tell us †, that the Lord Chief Juſtice *Richardſon* prohibited Revels, Church ales, and Clerk-ales upon the *Lord's Day*. But *Laud* forced him to revoke that order; and tho' the juſtices of the peace drew up a petition to the King, ſhewing the great inconveniencies which would befall the country, if they were permitted; yet before the petition could be delivered, *Laud* publiſhed by the King's order the declaration concerning recreations on the *Lord's Day*; which as *Ruſhworth* obſerves, *proved a ſnare to many miniſters, very conformable to the church of* England, *becauſe they refuſed to read the ſame publickly in the Church as was required. For upon this many were ſuſpended, and others ſilenced from preaching.* Was this the cuſtom of the primitive martyrs? Muſt men be forced to a prophanation of the ſabbath? Muſt the miniſters of the goſpel be obliged to cloſe the ſervice of God, even in the houſe of worſhip, with an exhortation to Revels and Church Ales? Or muſt they be perſecuted by ſuſpenſions and ſilencings for their refuſal? Is this your martyr and your ſaint? Rather than be numbered with ſuch ſaints and martyrs, *Sit anima mea cum Philoſophis.*

As to the caſe of Dr. *Leighton*, it appears a faithful narrative and repreſentation. The very diary of *Laud* himſelf confirms the

* Ruſhworth, Vol. I. p. 196.

the moſt cruel part of his uſage, and therefore leaves no room to doubt of the the truth of the other. In it there is this paſſage, which a man of common humanity could not have wrote without a bleeding heart. *Friday, Nov.* 16. *He* (Leighton) *was ſeverely whipt, and being ſet in the pillory he had one of his ears cut of, one ſide of his noſe ſlit, and branded on one check with a red hot iron. And on that day ſevenight* HIS SORES UPON HIS BACK, EAR, NOSE, AND FACE BEING NOT CURED, *he was whipped again at the pillory in* Cheapſide, *and there had the remainder of his ſentence executed upon him, by cutting off the other ear, ſlitting the other ſide of his noſe, and branding the other cheek.* Did your Martyr record this to eterniſe his relentleſs cruelty? You, with a ſpirit like his, tell your reader, *that* Laud *was not more rigorous, than* Leighton's *crimes deſerved.* Would you give the world to underſtand by this, what they muſt expect when ſuch prieſts as you ſit again in high places of power, and that your hands and heart are already prepared for mutilations and blood? I am far from vindicating *Leighton*'s conduct, if the things you mention out of his book are true; though the oppreſſions and violences, which had been practiſed by many of the biſhops, were ſuch as might have made even a wiſe man mad, and by all equitable perſons will be allowed as ſome excuſe for the very ſevereſt p. 72.

expreſſions

* Ruſhworth, Vol. I. p. 57, 58.

expreſſions of *Leighton* againſt them. However, this I will affirm, that a chriſtian biſhop ſhould have had no hand in ſuch a bloody ſentence, and that *Laud* would have acted a much more merciful part if he had ordered him to be immediately hanged. The Parliament * had a quite different ſenſe of *Leighton*'s ſufferings, and voted that the fine of 10000 pounds, and the ſentence of corporal puniſhment, and the execution thereof, and the impriſonment thereupon were illegal; and that the archbiſhop of *Canterbury*, then biſhop of *London*, ought to give ſatisfaction to *Leighton* for his damages ſuſtained by his fifteen weeks impriſonment in *Newgate* upon the ſaid biſhop's warrant.

As to Mr. *Limborch*'s teſtimony, I can aſſure you I am no more a general believer in him, than in your martyr *Laud*. Great allowances muſt be made for him as a foreigner, and therefore not well acquainted with the affairs of the *Engliſh* hiſtory. He had alſo probably an affection for *Laud*, becauſe of his embracing the *Arminian* principles, and appearing againſt the doctrinal part of popery. However, had his commendations of *Laud* been much more profuſe, they would have ſignified nothing againſt the truth of hiſtory. As you repreſent the matter it amounts to no more, than that *Limborch* thought he was no papiſt, and commended the letters he wrote to *Voſſius*.

* Ruſhworth, Vol. IV. p. 229. ad An. 1641.

Voſſius. And therefore I have not dealt unworthily by my own author, by painting that imperious prelate in his proper colours; nor indeed can I ſee any Reaſon, that becauſe I tranſlated Mr. *Limborch*'s *Hiſtory of the Inquiſition*, therefore I ſhould agree with him in all his characters of men; and eſpecially of thoſe, whoſe true character I have a much better opportunity of knowing than *Limborch* had. P. 74.

As to your prophetick curſe, that my name ſhall rot amongſt the wicked, I ſhall only ſay, that *as the bird by wandring, and the ſwallow by flying, ſo the curſe cauſeleſs ſhall not come*; and that I am of *Plutarch*'s mind, who ſaid, *I had rather men ſhould ſay of me, that there neither is, nor ever was ſuch an one as* Plutarch; *than that they ſhould ſay*, Plutarch *was an unſteady, changeable, eaſily provokable, and revengeful man.* May I periſh for ever from the memory of men, rather than be remembered as a tyrannical, haughty, perſecuting, relentleſs, bigotted prieſt; and if poſterity ſhould ever ſpeak of me, may it be as a lover of religion, a friend to the rights of conſcience, and an advocate for the civil and religious liberties of my country. This character I will endeavour to merit; and it is the only immortality amongſt men that I deſire.

Thus, Sir, have I conſidered your remarks, and I hope cleared myſelf from the charge of groſs miſrepreſentations of fact. I have only to add, that as you threaten me

me with due chaſtiſement from other hands, I ſhall be very glad if any learned and candid divine of the church of *England* will ſet me right in any matters wherein I have been miſtaken, and that I will ingenuouſly own any errours when they can be proved upon me. But if any perſon with your ſpirit, and in your ſtile, ſhall appear farther againſt me, he muſt excuſe me if I think him beneath my notice, and paſs him by with that intire ſilence and contempt he will deſerve.

I am, SIR,

Your's, &c.

S. C.